

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are pending, Claims 1, 4 and 5 having been amended by way of the present amendment. Support for the amendment is found in Figure 8 and the corresponding description at page 20, and therefore no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Abstract was objected to; and Claims 1-5 were rejected as being anticipated by Harada et al. (U.S. Patent 6,486,890).

In reply, the Abstract has been amended as requested.

At page 2 of the May 14, 2007 Advisory Action, the Advisory Action indicates that Applicant argues limitations not claimed. The Advisory Action asserts that the limitation “described relative to the position of a previous block” modifies which block is concerned, not the type of data. The Advisory Action also indicates that “furthermore, the term ‘relative to’ includes orientation”.

In reply, so as to expressly address the issues identified in the Office Action, each of the independent claims has been amended to state “said positional data including data that describes the position of the subsequent block in terms that are relative to the position of the previous block”. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that each of the independent claims now expressly includes these features.

Moreover, the positional data includes data that describes the position of a block in terms relative to a previous block. This was specifically added to avoid the broad claim construction made in the previous Office Action, where the Office Action concludes that Harada’s reference to “orientation of column and page sections”, corresponds with the claimed “location”. Furthermore, the outstanding Office Action associates this same teaching in Harada as being descriptive of the relative position of the blocks, not the data that

describes the position of one block relative to another block. It is believed that the present amendment to the claims specifically addresses this point and therefore distinguishes Harada which is merely referring to the orientation (landscape or portrait) of different page sections.

Rather than reiterate the same comments made in the last Response, Applicant incorporates by reference herein the explanation at page 4 of the Amendment filed April 23, 2007, as each of these arguments and explanations are equally valid in light of the presently pending claims. Moreover, it is believed that the present amendment addresses the issues that the Advisory Action indicates are argued but not previously claimed.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-5, as amended, is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 03/06)

BDL/rac



Bradley D. Lytle

Registration No. 40,073